

SO. CAL. EQUAL ACCESS GROUP  
Jason J. Kim (SBN 190246)  
Jason Yoon (SBN 306137)  
101 S. Western Ave., Second Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90004  
Telephone: (213) 252-8008  
Facsimile: (213) 252-8009  
scalequalaccess@yahoo.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
JEREMY HOLLAND

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

JEREMY HOLLAND,  
Plaintiff,

vs.

319-323 N. RODEO LLC; and DOES 1 to  
10,  
Defendants.

**Case No.:**

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE  
RELIEF AND DAMAGES FOR DENIAL  
OF CIVIL RIGHTS OF A DISABLED  
PERSON IN VIOLATIONS OF

1. AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES;
2. CALIFORNIA’S UNRUH CIVIL  
RIGHTS ACT;
3. CALIFORNIA’S DISABLED  
PERSONS ACT;
4. CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY  
CODE;
5. NEGLIGENCE

Plaintiff JEREMY HOLLAND (“Plaintiff”) complains of Defendants 319-323 N.  
RODEO LLC; and DOES 1 to 10 (“Defendants”) and alleges as follows:

//

//

**PARTIES**

1  
2 1. Plaintiff is a California resident with a physical disability. Plaintiff is  
3 diagnosed with complete paraplegia due to spinal cord injury. Plaintiff requires the use  
4 of a wheelchair at all times when traveling in public.

5 2. Defendants are, or were at the time of the incident, the real property owners,  
6 business operators, lessors and/or lessees of the real property for a boutique (“Business”) located at or about 319 N. Rodeo Dr., Beverly Hills, California.

7  
8 3. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or  
9 otherwise of Defendant DOES 1 through 10, and each of them, are unknown to Plaintiff,  
10 who therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will ask leave of  
11 Court to amend this Complaint when the true names and capacities have been  
12 ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and, based thereon, alleges that each such  
13 fictitiously named Defendants are responsible in some manner, and therefore, liable to  
14 Plaintiff for the acts herein alleged.

15 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that, at all relevant  
16 times, each of the Defendants was the agent, employee, or alter-ego of each of the other  
17 Defendants, and/or was acting in concert with each of the other Defendants, and in doing  
18 the things alleged herein was acting with the knowledge and consent of the other  
19 Defendants and within the course and scope of such agency or employment relationship.

20 5. Whenever and wherever reference is made in this Complaint to any act or  
21 failure to act by a defendant or Defendants, such allegations and references shall also be  
22 deemed to mean the acts and failures to act of each Defendant acting individually, jointly  
23 and severally.

24 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

25 6. The Court has jurisdiction of this action pursuant to 28 USC §§ 1331 and  
26 1343 for violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, (42 USC §12101, *et*  
27 *seq.*)  
28

1           7. Pursuant to pendant jurisdiction, attendant and related causes of action,  
2 arising from the same nucleus of operating facts, are also brought under California law,  
3 including, but not limited to, violations of California Civil Code §§51, 51.5, 52(a), 52.1,  
4 54, 54., 54.3 and 55.

5           8. Plaintiff's claims are authorized by 28 USC §§ 2201 and 2202.

6           9. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 USC §1391(b). The real  
7 property which is the subject of this action is located in this district, Los Angeles County,  
8 California, and that all actions complained of herein take place in this district.

9                                   **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

10          10. In or about April of 2022, Plaintiff went to the Business.

11          11. The Business is a boutique business establishment, open to the public, and is  
12 a place of public accommodation and affects commerce through its operation. Defendants  
13 provide parking spaces for customers.

14          12. While attempting to enter the Business during each visit, Plaintiff personally  
15 encountered a number of barriers that interfered with his ability to use and enjoy the  
16 goods, services, privileges, and accommodations offered at the Business.

17          13. To the extent of Plaintiff's personal knowledge, the barriers at the Business  
18 included, but were not limited to, the following:

- 19               a. Defendants failed to comply with the federal and state standards for  
20 the parking space designated for persons with disabilities. Defendants  
21 failed to post required signage such as "Van Accessible," "Minimum  
22 Fine \$250" and "Unauthorized Parking."  
23               b. Defendant failed to maintain the parking space designated for persons  
24 with disabilities to comply with the federal and state standards.  
25 Defendants failed to maintain the paint on the ground as required.  
26               c. Defendants failed to maintain the parking space designated for  
27 persons with disabilities to comply with the federal and state  
28

standards. Defendants failed to maintain the mark on the space with the International Symbol of Accessibility.

14. These barriers and conditions denied Plaintiff the full and equal access to the Business and caused him difficulty and frustration. Plaintiff wishes to return and patronize the Business, however, Plaintiff is deterred from visiting the Business because his knowledge of these violations prevents him from returning until the barriers are removed.

15. Based on the violations, Plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that there are additional barriers to accessibility at the Business after further site inspection. Plaintiff seeks to have all barriers related to his disability remedied. *See Doran v. 7-Eleven, Inc.* 524 F.3d 1034 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2008).

16. In addition, Plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that Defendants knew that particular barriers render the Business inaccessible, violate state and federal law, and interfere with access for the physically disabled.

17. At all relevant times, Defendants had and still have control and dominion over the conditions at this location and had and still have the financial resources to remove these barriers without much difficulty or expenses to make the Business accessible to the physically disabled in compliance with ADDAG and Title 24 regulations. Defendants have not removed such barriers and have not modified the Business to conform to accessibility regulations.

### **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990**

18. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations in all prior paragraphs in this complaint.

19. Under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (“ADA”), no individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place of

1 public accommodation by any person who owns, leases, or leases to, or operates a place  
2 of public accommodation. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).

3 20. Discrimination, *inter alia*, includes:

- 4 a. A failure to make reasonable modification in policies, practices, or  
5 procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford such  
6 goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations  
7 to individuals with disabilities, unless the entity can demonstrate that  
8 making such modifications would fundamentally alter the nature of  
9 such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or  
10 accommodations. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).
- 11 b. A failure to take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that no  
12 individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or  
13 otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the  
14 absence of auxiliary aids and services, unless the entity can  
15 demonstrate that taking such steps would fundamentally alter the  
16 nature of the good, service, facility, privilege, advantage, or  
17 accommodation being offered or would result in an undue burden. 42  
18 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iii).
- 19 c. A failure to remove architectural barriers, and communication barriers  
20 that are structural in nature, in existing facilities, and transportation  
21 barriers in existing vehicles and rail passenger cars used by an  
22 establishment for transporting individuals (not including barriers that  
23 can only be removed through the retrofitting of vehicles or rail  
24 passenger cars by the installation of a hydraulic or other lift), where  
25 such removal is readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).
- 26 d. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the maximum  
27 extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are readily  
28 accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including

1 individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the maximum  
2 extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and the  
3 bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the altered  
4 area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with  
5 disabilities where such alterations to the path or travel or the  
6 bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the altered  
7 area are not disproportionate to the overall alterations in terms of cost  
8 and scope. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).

9 21. Where parking spaces are provided, accessible parking spaces shall be  
10 provided. 1991 ADA Standards § 4.1.2(5); 2010 ADA Standards § 208. One in every  
11 eight accessible spaces, but not less than one, shall be served by an access aisle 96 in  
12 (2440 mm) wide minimum and shall be designated “van accessible.” 1991 ADA  
13 Standards § 4.1.2(5)(b). For every six or fraction of six parking spaces, at least one shall  
14 be van parking space. 2010 ADA Standards § 208.2.4.

15 22. Under the ADA, the method and color of marking are to be addressed by  
16 State or local laws or regulations. *See* 36 C.F.R., Part 1191. Under the California  
17 Building Code (“CBC”), the parking space identification signs shall include the  
18 International Symbol of Accessibility. Parking identification signs shall be reflectorized  
19 with a minimum area of 70 square inches. Additional language or an additional sign  
20 below the International Symbol of Accessibility shall state “Minimum Fine \$250.” A  
21 parking space identification sign shall be permanently posted immediately adjacent and  
22 visible from each parking space, shall be located with its centerline a maximum of 12  
23 inches from the centerline of the parking space and may be posted on a wall at the  
24 interior end of the parking space. *See* CBC § 11B-502.6, *et seq.*

25 23. Moreover, an additional sign shall be posted either in a conspicuous place at  
26 each entrance to an off-street parking facility or immediately adjacent to on-site  
27 accessible parking and visible from each parking space. The additional sign shall not be  
28 less than 17 inches wide by 22 inches high. The additional sign shall clearly state in

1 letters with a minimum height of 1 inch the following: “Unauthorized vehicles parked in  
2 designated accessible spaces not displaying distinguishing placards or special license  
3 plates issued for persons with disabilities will be towed always at the owner’s expense...”  
4 *See* CBC § 11B-502.8, *et seq.*

5 24. Here, Defendants failed to provide signs stating “Minimum Fine \$250” and  
6 “Van Accessible.” Moreover, Defendants failed to provide the additional sign with the  
7 specific languages stating “Unauthorized vehicles parked in designated accessible spaces  
8 not displaying distinguishing placards or special license plates issued for persons with  
9 disabilities will be towed always at the owner’s expense...”

10 25. For the parking spaces, access aisles shall be marked with a blue painted  
11 borderline around their perimeter. The area within the blue borderlines shall be marked  
12 with hatched lines a maximum of 36 inches (914 mm) on center in a color contrasting  
13 with that of the aisle surface, preferably blue or white. The words "NO PARKING" shall  
14 be painted on the surface within each access aisle in white letters a minimum of 12 inches  
15 (305 mm) in height and located to be visible from the adjacent vehicular way. CBC §  
16 11B-502.3.3.

17 26. Here, Defendants failed to properly maintain the access aisles as there were  
18 no “NO PARKING” and faded blue lines painted on the parking surface.

19 27. The surface of each accessible car and van space shall have surface  
20 identification complying with either of the following options: The outline of a profile  
21 view of a wheel chair with occupant in white on a blue background a minimum 36” wide  
22 by 36” high (914 mm x 914 mm). The centerline of the profile view shall be a maximum  
23 of 6 inches (152 mm) from the centerline of the parking space, its sides parallel to the  
24 length of the parking space and its lower side or corner aligned with the end of the  
25 parking space length or by outlining or painting the parking space in blue and outlining  
26 on the ground in white or a suitable contrasting color a profile view of a wheel chair with  
27 occupant. *See* CBC § 11B-502.6.4, *et seq.*







1           34. California Civil Code § 51(f) specifies, “a violation of the right of any  
2 individual under federal Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-336)  
3 shall also constitute a violation of this section.”

4           35. The actions and omissions of Defendants alleged herein constitute a denial  
5 of full and equal accommodation, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services by  
6 physically disabled persons within the meaning of California Civil Code §§ 51 and 52.  
7 Defendants have discriminated against Plaintiff in violation of California Civil Code §§  
8 51 and 52.

9           36. The violations of the Unruh Civil Rights Act caused Plaintiff to experience  
10 difficulty, discomfort, or embarrassment. The Defendants are also liable for statutory  
11 damages as specified in California Civil Code §55.56(a)-(c).

12                           **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

13                   **VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA DISABLED PERSONS ACT**

14           37. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations in all prior  
15 paragraphs in this complaint.

16           38. California Civil Code § 54.1(a) states, “Individuals with disabilities shall be  
17 entitled to full and equal access, as other members of the general public, to  
18 accommodations, advantages, facilities, medical facilities, including hospitals, clinics,  
19 and physicians’ offices, and privileges of all common carriers, airplanes, motor vehicles,  
20 railroad trains, motorbuses, streetcars, boats, or any other public conveyances or modes  
21 of transportation (whether private, public, franchised, licensed, contracted, or otherwise  
22 provided), telephone facilities, adoption agencies, private schools, hotels, loading places,  
23 places of public accommodations, amusement, or resort, and other places in which the  
24 general public is invited, subject only to the conditions and limitations established by  
25 law, or state or federal regulation, and applicable alike to all persons.

26           39. California Civil Code § 54.3(a) states, “Any person or persons, firm or  
27 corporation who denies or interferes with admittance to or enjoyment of public facilities  
28 as specified in Sections 54 and 54.1 or otherwise interferes with the rights of an

individual with a disability under Sections 54, 54.1 and 54.2 is liable for each offense for the actual damages, and any amount as may be determined by a jury, or a court sitting without a jury, up to a maximum of three times the amount of actual damages but in no case less than one thousand dollars (\$1,000) and any attorney's fees that may be determined by the court in addition thereto, suffered by any person denied the rights provided in Section 54, 54.1, and 54.2.

40. California Civil Code § 54(d) specifies, "a violation of the right of an individual under Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-336) also constitute a violation of this section, and nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the access of any person in violation of that act.

41. The actions and omissions of Defendants alleged herein constitute a denial of full and equal accommodation, advantages, and facilities by physically disabled persons within the meaning of California Civil Code § 54. Defendants have discriminated against Plaintiff in violation of California Civil Code § 54.

42. The violations of the California Disabled Persons Act caused Plaintiff to experience difficulty, discomfort, and embarrassment. The Defendants are also liable for statutory damages as specified in California Civil Code §55.56(a)-(c).

#### **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

##### **CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 19955, et seq.**

43. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations in all prior paragraphs in this complaint.

44. Plaintiff and other similar physically disabled persons who require the use of a wheelchair are unable to use public facilities on a "full and equal" basis unless each such facility is in compliance with the provisions of California Health & Safety Code § 19955 et seq. Plaintiff is a member of the public whose rights are protected by the provisions of California Health & Safety Code § 19955 et seq.

45. The purpose of California Health & Safety Code § 1995 et seq. is to ensure that public accommodations or facilities constructed in this state with private funds

1 adhere to the provisions of Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 4450) of Division 5 of  
 2 Title 1 of the Government Code. The code relating to such public accommodations also  
 3 require that “when sanitary facilities are made available for the public, clients, or  
 4 employees in these stations, centers, or buildings, they shall be made available for  
 5 persons with disabilities.

6 46. Title II of the ADA holds as a “general rule” that no individual shall be  
 7 discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of goods  
 8 (or use), services, facilities, privileges, and accommodations offered by any person who  
 9 owns, operates, or leases a place of public accommodation. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).  
 10 Further, each and every violation of the ADA also constitutes a separate and distinct  
 11 violation of California Civil Code §§ 54(c) and 54.1(d), thus independently justifying an  
 12 award of damages and injunctive relief pursuant to California law, including but not  
 13 limited to Civil Code § 54.3 and Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq.

#### 14 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### 15 **NEGLIGENCE**

16 47. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations in all prior  
 17 paragraphs in this complaint.

18 48. Defendants have a general duty and a duty under the ADA, Unruh Civil  
 19 Rights Act and California Disabled Persons Act to provide safe and accessible facilities  
 20 to the Plaintiff.

21 49. Defendants breached their duty of care by violating the provisions of ADA,  
 22 Unruh Civil Rights Act and California Disabled Persons Act.

23 50. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ negligent conduct, Plaintiff  
 24 has suffered damages.

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully prays for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

1. For preliminary and permanent injunction directing Defendants to comply with the Americans with Disability Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act;
2. Award of all appropriate damages, including but not limited to statutory damages, general damages and treble damages in amounts, according to proof;
3. Award of all reasonable restitution for Defendants' unfair competition practices;
4. Reasonable attorney's fees, litigation expenses, and costs of suit in this action;
5. Prejudgment interest pursuant to California Civil Code § 3291; and
6. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

**DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY**

Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Dated: July 11, 2022

SO. CAL. EQUAL ACCESS GROUP

By: /s/ Jason J. Kim  
Jason J. Kim, Esq.  
Attorneys for Plaintiff